

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMME United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/698,106	10/31/2003	Karla M. Robotti	10030204-1	8960	
75	7590 05/02/2006 AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			EXAMINER	
				BRADLEY, CHRISTINA	
Legal Department, DL429 Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 7599 Loveland, CO 80537-0599			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1654		
			DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicar	nt(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/698,106	10/698,106 ROBOTTI, KARLA M.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Christina Bradley	1654				
D!  4 6	The MAILING DATE of this communication	on appears on the cover	sheet with the correspond	dence address			
Period for							
WHIO - Extending - Extending - If No - Faile Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR INCHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicated of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, but reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COI CFR 1.136(a). In no event, howev tion. period will apply and will expire Si y statute, cause the application to l	MMUNICATION. er, may a reply be timely filed IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing dispecome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C.	ate of this communication. § 133).			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	20 March 2006.					
·	• •	This action is non-final	•				
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice un	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 19	935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 2	13.			
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.						
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>22-37</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirem	ent.				
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	☐ accepted or b)☐ obje	cted to by the Examiner.	,			
	Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1	l.85(a).			
—	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by t	the Examiner. Note the a	ittached Office Action or	form PTO-152.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	oreign priority under 35 L	J.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f)				
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority docu						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the			National Stage			
* 0	application from the International E See the attached detailed Office action for	•	••				
`	see the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified cop	ies not received.				
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) 🔯 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 In	terview Summary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 mation Disclosure Statement(s)		aper No(s)/Mail Date  otice of Informal Patent Applic	ation (PTO-152)			
	r No(s)/Mail Date		ther:				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Status of Claims

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-21 in the reply filed on 4/12/2006 is acknowledged. Claims 22-37 are withdrawn from consideration.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou *et al.* (*Nat. Biotech.*, **2001**, *19*, 375-378) in view of Kundu & Roy (*J. Lipid Res.*, **1979**, *20*, 825-833). Zhou *et al.* teach a method to purify phosphorylated peptides from a complex mixture of phosphorylated and unphosphorylated peptides and other molecules comprising the following steps: 1) protection of the peptide amino groups with *t*-butyl-dicarbonate (tBoc); 2) carbodiimide-catalyzed condensation of the peptide and an amine to form amide and phosphoramidate bonds at the carboxylate and phosphate bonds of the peptide, respectively; 3) regeneration of the phosphates by brief acid hydrolysis; 4) carbodiimide-catalyzed condensation of cystamine and the regenerated phosphate, and reduction of the internal disulfide of cystamine to generate a free sulfhydryl for every phosphate group of the peptide; 5) solid-phase capture of the

Application/Control Number: 10/698,106

Art Unit: 1654

phosphopeptides by reaction of the sulfhydryl groups with iodoacetyl groups immobilized on glass beads; and 6) cleavage of phosphoramidate bonds with trifluoroacetic acid to regenerate the phosphates (see Figure 1). The method taught by Zhou et al. is similar to the method of claim 1 for the following reasons. Step 2 of Zhou et al. is equivalent to step a of claim 1 with the exception that Zhou et al. does not teach that the amine can be attached to a solid support, i.e. the first resin described in step a. Step 3 of Zhou et al. is equivalent to step b of claim 1. The TFA treatment used by Zhou et al. in step 3 achieves the same outcome as step b of claim 1: selective cleavage of the amine from the phosphate groups. Step 4 of Zhou et al. is equivalent to step c of claim 1. Here the cystamine of Zhou et al. functions as the capture ligand of claim 1, step c. Step 5 of Zhou et al. is equivalent to step d of claim 1. The reaction of the sulfhydryl groups with iodoacetyl groups attached to glass beads in step 5 of Zhou et al. accomplishes the same outcome as claim 1, step d: the separation of peptides bound to the capture ligand from peptides that are not bound to the capture ligand. Finally, step 1 of Zhou et al. meets the additional limitation described in claim 4: the protection of the peptide amine groups before the reaction with the first resin.

As stated above, Zhou et al. do not teach that the amine in step 2 is attached to a resin. Kundu & Ray teach a aminopropyl silica gel solid support which contains a free amino group available for reaction (see scheme 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the aminopropyl silica gel taught by Kundu & Roy for the amine in step 2 of Zhou et al. In doing so, one would meet all of the limitation of claims 1 and 5; the reaction in step 2 of Zhou et al. would involve a resin making it

Application/Control Number: 10/698,106 Page 4

Art Unit: 1654

equivalent to claim 1, step a, and that resin would comprise a primary amine as in claim 5. In addition, all of the limitations of claim 6 would be met because the TFA used in step 2 of Zhou et al. is a weak acid. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to make this combination given that the attachment of the amine in step 2 of Zhou to a solid support would permit the physical separation of the coupled peptides from the rest of the mixture and would permit extensive washing of the sample to further remove impurities without affecting the phosphopeptide (as performed in steps 5 and 6 in Zhou with the second resin). There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given that the chemical reaction required to couple the resin taught by Kundu & Roy to the peptide (the carbodiimide-catalyzed condensation of an amine and carboxylic acid) is routinely employed in protein chemistry and solid phase peptide synthesis (see Zhou et al.), and that the amino group in the resin taught by Kundu & Roy was shown to be coupled to another molecule. In addition, aminopropyl silica gel and functionally equivalent products are commercially available. Thus, the invention as a whole was clearly prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou *et al.* (*Nat. Biotech.*, **2001**, *19*, 375-378) as applied to claims 1 and 4-6 above in further view of Holmes (USPN 5,679,773). Step 6 of Zhou *et al.* meets the additional limitation described in claim 3: the cleavage of the bond between the capture ligand and the phosphorylated peptides following separation from the

unphosphorylated peptides in the preceding step. Zhou et al. do not teach that the amine of step 2 can be cleaved from the peptide prior to step 6 (i.e. that the first resin can be selectively cleaved before separating the peptides bound to the capture ligand as described in claim 2). Likewise, Zhou et al. do not teach that such cleavage can be photo-induced (claim 11) or that the first resin is photocleavable and has a plurality of groups represented by the structural formula in claim 12. Holmes teaches a photochemically-cleavable linking group identical to the formula in claim 12 (see column 14, compound 8) attached to a solid support such as a resin (see column 14, lines 40-50).

Page 5

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method for phosphopeptide purification taught by Zhou et al. and the photochemicallycleavable linker resin taught by Holmes. The photochemically-cleavable linker resin would function as the first resin in claim 2, 3, 11 and 12. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so because Holmes teaches that the photochemically-cleavable linking group resin can be coupled via its amine to the carboxylic acid group of a peptide or amino acid (column 19, lines 10-19). In addition, the particular resin taught by Holmes is designed for highly-selective photoinduced cleavage (see abstract and Figure 2). By inducing such cleavage prior to step 6, unphosphorylated peptides can be isolated from the mixture. The light-induced cleavage would not interfere with the linkage between the second resin and the phosphopeptides. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given that the chemical reaction required to couple the linker taught by Holmes to the peptide (the carbodiimide-catalyzed condensation of

an amine and carboxylic acid) is routinely employed in protein chemistry and solid phase peptide synthesis. Thus, the invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou *et al.* and Holmes as applied to claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 above in further view of Fields *et al.* (*Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.,* **1988**, *85*, 1384-1388). Zhou *et al.* do not teach that the amine of step 2 can be an amino acid coupled to a resin or that the amino acid can be isotopically labeled. Fields *et al.* teach the incorporation of an isotopically-labeled amino acid (Fmoc-[<sup>15</sup>N]alanine) into a peptide by solid phase synthesis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to couple the Fmoc[15N]alanine taught by Fields *et al.* to the photocleavable-linker resin taught by Holmes, and to combine it with the method for phosphopeptide taught by Zhou *et al.* The Fmoc[15N]alanine-photocleavable-linker-resin, following deprotection of the amine, would be used in place of the amine in step 2 of Zhou *et al.* and would function as the first resin described in claims 7-10. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to make this modification given that the method would result in the incorporation of an isotope label useful for downstream mass spectrometry or NMR applications (see Zhou *et al.* and Fields *et al.*). There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given that the chemical reaction required to couple the linker taught by Holmes to the Fmoc[15N]alanine (the carbodiimide-catalyzed condensation of an amine and carboxylic acid) is routinely employed in protein chemistry and solid phase peptide synthesis (see Zhou

et al. and Fields et al.). Thus, the invention as a whole was clearly prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou et al. and Holmes as applied to claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 above in further view of Oda et al. (Nat. Biotech., 2001, 19, 379-382). Zhou et al. do not teach using a molecular recognition system to capture phosphopeptides. Oda et al. teach a method for enriching phosphorylated peptides from a complex mixture using the biotin-avidin interaction. The method of Oda et al. comprises converting the phosphate group in the peptides in several steps to biotin, and capturing the modified peptides with an avidin resin column (see Oda et al. Figure 1 and page 381, column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace steps 4-6 of Zhou et al. (including the modification from Holmes as described above) with the method taught by Oda et al. In doing so, the biotin would function as the capture ligand and the avidin resin would function as the affinity resin described in claims 18-21. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to make this modification given that Oda et al. use their method to enrich phosphopeptides from a complex mixture (the same purpose as the claimed method and the method in Zhou et al.), and that the biotin-avidin interaction has exceptionally high affinity and specificity. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given that the methods taught by Oda et al. and Zhou et al. resulted in the purification of phosphopeptides from a complex mixture and that the use of the biotin-avidin molecular recognition system is ubiquitous in a variety of

applications. Thus, the invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou et al., Holmes and Fields et al. as applied to 2, 3 and 7-12 above in further view of Mercader et al. (Anal. Biochem., 2002, 308, 269-277). Zhou et al. do not teach that the coupling and subsequent capture of the phosphate groups of steps 4-6 can be performed with an amino acid attached to a magnetic bead (i.e. that the capture ligand is a second resin and that the second resin is an amino acid attached to a magnetic bead). Mercader et al. teach the coupling of an aliphatic carboxylate group to Dynabeads M270 amine using a carbodiimide (see page 271). The Dynabeads are magnetic. Fields et al. teach Fmoc-protected amino acids and there use in solid phase peptide synthesis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to couple an Fmocamino acid (such as Fmoc-tryptophan) of Fields *et al.* to the Dynabeads by the method in Mercader *et al.* and, following deprotection of the amine, use it to react with the phosphate groups following step 3 of Zhou *et al.* In doing so, the amino acid would function as the capture ligand. Because it is coupled to a magnetic bead, the capture ligand would also be a second resin. All limitations of claims 13-16 would be met. One would have been motivated to make this modification because magnetic beads permit easy separation of a captured compound from a mixture as suggested by Mercader *et al.* There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given that given that

the chemical reaction required to couple the amino acid and the phosphate groups of the phosphopeptides is the same as that used successfully in step 2 of Zhou et al.

Thus, the invention as a whole was clearly prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

### Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christina Bradley whose telephone number is (571) 272-9044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmb

BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600** 

Brune Campell

Page 10